

attention to the clauses involving expenditure and shall also give an estimate of the recurring and non-recurring expenditure involved in case the Bill is passed into law.

“80. If any member desires to move an amendment which under the Constitution cannot be moved without previous sanction or recommendation, he shall annex to the notice of the proposed amendment a copy of such sanction or recommendation and the notice shall not be valid until this requirement is complied with.”

It fully supports what Mr. Sivappa has stated, that if an amendment is moved to an amendment financial implications are there.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The hon'ble member is trying to support Sri Sivappa with regard to the point that financial memorandum and the annexure which I mention as not being part of the Bill, is part of the Bill.

Sri L. SRIKANTAI AH.—Then, shall we take that schedule and annexure are not part of the Bill Let us to go the interpretation of the statute.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It will be a matter of time to canvass the whole procedure. Is he talking to schedule to the Bill or annexure to the financial memorandum?

Sri L. SRIKANTAI AH.—I am talking of the annexure to the financial memorandum.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is it the same as schedule?

Sri L. SRIKANTAI AH.—Yes.

*

*

*

Mr. SPEAKER.—Professor Srikantiah intervened, perhaps not very rightly and wanted to support the points raised by Sri S. Sivappa, the Leader of the Opposition. He drew my attention to two rules which were canvassed at great length even at the time of introduction of the amending Bill. His ultimate conclusion reduced itself to this, namely, that an annexure which constitutes a part of the financial memorandum is on par or equivalent to schedule and inasmuch as a schedule forms a part of the Bill this also forms a part of the Bill. I do not know how I can possibly accept such a contention. I do not think I can ever do it, unless there is some authority or something which has escaped my attention.

The point suggested by Sri H. Siddaveerappa will also be dealt with in its proper place. That point is that the idea contained in the amendment is not an idea which is found in the amending Bill in any of its portion. The idea of the amendment is with regard to certain provisions where a member can say that he will not draw the salary or allowances or give up a part of it. This point, I will deal with a little later. The amendment to an amendment is permissible and therefore we

(Mr. SPEAKER)

have to see whether the amendment to the amendment is in order or not. In other words, if the amending Bill is there, an amendment to the amendment is in the shape of an amendment to the amending Bill. To see whether an amendment is within the scope of the original amendment we have to see whether there is any inconsistency or whether it traverses beyond the ambit of the amendment. It was incidentally suggested that article 207 will come in the course of consideration and therefore that will operate as a bar. I would like the hon. Member Sri Siddaveerappa to be precise as to whether the amendment goes beyond the limits of the amending Bill. I am saying that because the wording I have seen in the amendment is not of a positive character and is of a negative character. In fact, it does not impose any disability upon anybody. The word used there is 'may' which means on his own volition a member can do anything. I would like him to consider one aspect. Suppose that amendment is accepted and thereafter a member says, "I don't want to draw", will that not have the same effect as the amendment which is sought to be embodied? Therefore, to jump to the conclusion and say that these things are not there in the original Act and therefore it is something which is beyond the scope and that Governor's recommendation is necessary—it is not so bad as that.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Our objection precisely is that the amendment that is now sought to be moved is something extraneous to the amending Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is a new idea that is sought to be canvassed, a new proposition that is sought to be introduced.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Even in the original Bill we do not find a clause like that. I would like to know from the experienced Parliamentarian that Sri Kothawale is whether there is any precedent for this in any part of the world, not to speak of any of India. We are setting up new precedents.

Mr. SPEAKER.—We will thoroughly examine it. I have given enough material for the members to study and put forth further arguments.

The House will now adjourn to re-assemble tomorrow at 1 P.M.

The House adjourned at Six of the clock to meet again at one of the Clock on Friday the 4th August 1967.
